

## FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES

### FOLLOW-UP TO ACADEMIC BOARD PHASE 1 REVIEW

Prior to the compiling of this section of the report, comments were sought from Associate Deans and HOS, so that the range of actions triggered by the Academic Board Review Phase 1 (ABR1) recommendations can be appreciated. It was felt this was important as the diversity of disciplines leads to varied responses.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Recommendation 1</b>  | <p>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate ways to promote stronger staff and student integration into the broader University community.</p>  |
| <b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>                                     | <p>Whilst the spirit of this recommendation is accepted it is not seen by students as a significant academic issue as evidenced by established feedback mechanisms. There are comments about access to sports and club facilities and activities which are largely absent on the Cumberland campus, and the level of Guild fees that students are still required to pay. Institutional and distance factors prevail here. The item below re. Flexsis is relevant.</p> <p>The adoption centrally of a <i>'Whole of University'</i> culture would greatly assist. We are often forgotten and have to ask to be included in University initiatives that are planned without due consideration of the multi-campus nature of the University of Sydney.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students and staff are jointly involved in career days to promote the Faculty and courses across the university.</li> <li>• Multi-disciplinary Interest in Rural and General Health Education (MIRAGE) is a group that runs across the university and has students from all faculties in it. Efforts are being made to inform students.</li> <li>• Joint degree between ESS and Science to commence in 2004.</li> <li>• Involvement in a clinical education project, the "Inter-professional Learning Initiative", in conjunction with Northern Clinical School. The aim is to promote learning activities in a multidisciplinary student team and to increase exposure to broader university learning environments.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation of Flexsis has started and FHS will go live in 2005. This will allow greater flexibility of enrolments. Currently joint degrees or UOS sharing requires parallel enrolment</li> <li>• Flexsis implementation will allow the issue of a standard student ID card. The FHS card is not accepted on Camperdown without special arrangement, inhibiting students accessing many University facilities.</li> <li>• At the 2003 CHS retreat, the prospect of students from many disciplines sharing a joint UOS was discussed. An example of Indigenous Health Issues which could involve medicine, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy and the FHS disciplines was considered. This action is still being considered and could be an enhancement of the "Inter-professional Learning Initiative" mentioned above.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiatives in this area will take some time to be reflected in feedback.</li> <li>• Two pilot placements undertaken in the "Inter-professional Learning Initiative", and evaluation carried out for the project advisory team. Positive responses from students and staff involved. Planning for continuation of placements is still to be determined. Such initiatives are high in resources and student time and there are equity of opportunity issues.</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Recommendation 2</b>  | The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider ways of improving communication of the Teaching and Learning Plan to all students   |
| <b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T&amp;L Plan was distributed to all members of the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) including the student representative in March 2003. All members were advised to communicate the plan to representative groups.</li> <li>• Advice was sought from the Student Representative on the TLC in December 2002, as to best way to communicate T&amp;L Plan to students. He suggested the use of focus groups.</li> <li>• The initial phase of the TIF Project 2003-2004 (Appendix C.3) involves focus groups of students. These students have been invited by the Student Guild and the first group will meet mid September. The Project Team will communicate the T&amp;L Plan to these students and demonstrate how the project they are contributing to forms an important part of the Plan.</li> <li>• The TLC suggested asking the Student Guild to include the T&amp;L plan in their student publication <i>Corpus Callosum</i>. The relevant Guild person considered that the material had little intrinsic interest to students.</li> <li>• The T&amp;L plan is on the Faculty web site.</li> <li>• Student representatives on School Boards and committees will hear specific reference to T&amp;L plans and will be asked to pass on relevant information.</li> <li>• Individual academics identify issues in lectures that apply to the T&amp;L plan and the wider university. Generic attributes are regularly raised and built into the UOS guide. Anecdotally there is little student interest as they see it as housekeeping not core content.</li> <li>• All schools have an UG Policy Handbook which is distributed to all students. This contains all relevant information regarding the Faculty, school and Academic Board (AB) policies and guidelines. In future a reference will be made to the Faculty T&amp;L plan being on the web.</li> <li>• Policies are discussed in the Year 1 orientation, which is scheduled in O week and in the first 6 weeks of semester 1.</li> <li>• Increasingly UOS outlines use a template that includes references to where issues of generic attributes and T&amp;L aims are addressed</li> </ul> |
| <b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools are moving to the provision of Policy documents etc on the Web rather than in hard copy as students often cannot find their hardcopy soon after it has been provided. Students are increasingly web oriented and equity of access issues are less with improved on-campus IT facilities. This will make on-line links to other policy sources and plans more relevant.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The student representative on the TLC will be asked at the November meeting if the action taken by the Faculty has been successful.</li> <li>• At later TIF focus groups students will be asked about their T&amp;L awareness.</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Recommendation 3</b>  | The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider oversighting each School's completion of a mapping exercise of assignment submission dates with the aim of ensuring that students are not overloaded   |
| <b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty was somewhat surprised at part of this recommendation as there has been a long standing process for the consideration of assessment spread at assessment program meetings (APM) as per Faculty policy (Faculty of Health Sciences Course Assessment Manual, Pages 2 and 3). It is felt that students are probably largely ignorant of this process.</li> <li>• Each school holds APMs each semester at which the appropriateness of assessments and their timing are considered. A liaison lecturer from BIOS and BACHS is appointed for each school where relevant, so that timings for non-home school assessments are included.</li> <li>• CDU assessments are scheduled in a Faculty-wide meeting and are sent to all Faculty staff for consideration in school APMs.</li> <li>• Students are given an outline of assessments and due dates (as per Faculty policy).</li> <li>• The TLC with advice from DMAC, constructed a form to be used to ensure that the process described in the Course Assessment Manual has been carried out. A question specifically asking whether input from students had been considered in the APM, was included. This form is to be completed following the School's APM and sent to the TLC for over sighting.</li> <li>• Workload has consistently been the subject of comment in student feedback and the Faculty has previously produced guidelines in terms of the quantum of assessment per credit point that all schools should use as part of APM considerations.</li> <li>• Student comments in CEQ and SCEQ about workload, can also be taken to relate to the total curriculum content to be covered by students, not just the amount of assessment. This is difficult in the context of an exploding knowledge base in all disciplines. Schools carrying out course reviews are looking at curricula in terms of 'total student effort' not just contact hours, especially as the use of independent learning components increases.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring by UGSC of all curriculum revisions for UG programs to ensure that workload and assessment is optimised for the efficient achievement of course objectives.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback from AVS, BACHS and OLS states that students appear informed and happy with the process. They use the APM meetings to raise issues about assessment dates and workload.</li> <li>• Appears the issue is more one of student awareness and may occur more in schools where the students rarely attend APMs.</li> <li>• Response to changes will take time to feed through to SCEQ and CEQ.</li> </ul>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Recommendation 4</b>  | The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider developing a more consistent policy on feedback and communicate to students what is meant by feedback   |
| <b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>                                     | <p>Feedback from schools and the known use of feedback in the Faculty was considered by the TLC. It was decided that the major problems appeared to be a lack of awareness amongst students of what constituted feedback and the wide range of mechanisms used across the Faculty. Some staff comment was made about how little use many students made of the feedback provided.</p> <p>The Faculty does not wish to stifle the innovative provision of feedback given by many staff, but does wish to establish a baseline minimum standard, plus educate students in the meaning of feedback and their responsibility to use it.</p> <p>A successful application was made for a TIF Grant (\$80K) for 2003-2004 to research, consider and implement best practice use of grade descriptors in the FHS. This will facilitate the development of a more consistent policy on feedback. The grant application, budget and timeline are contained in Appendix C.3. The project officer has been employed, the literature search and initial student focus groups carried out.</p> <p>The following selected responses are indicative of school initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AVS has responded to this issue by identifying feedback when it occurs (students are now identifying that feedback is happening and is good). The level of feedback has not actually changed – the definition of feedback has. Students identify feedback to be written and individual. Other forms of staff provided feedback are often not recognised.</li> <li>• CSD students are advised in their Clinic Handbooks about the developmental model of supervision and feedback that clinical educators (Ces) are trained to use. CEs are encouraged to describe this model explicitly to students so they understand the process.</li> <li>• OLS students receive feedback in several forms:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• directly written on assignments</li> <li>• summary feedback page to year via assignment insert</li> <li>• verbal/individual feedback as requested.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
| <b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b> | <p>Some schools have indicated that they will progressively modify their standard unit of study guides to include sections related to the ways feedback is delivered in each unit of study.</p> <p>The TIF Project is on-going until June 2004 and will require staged action as described.</p>  |
| <b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AVS indicates that USE reports are now rating feedback to be good.</li> <li>• It is too early to comment on the TIF outcomes. They will be evaluated at the end of 2004.</li> </ul>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Recommendation 5</b>  | The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider prioritising the usefulness of WebCT either as a pedagogical tool to support a unit of study, or for the provision of delivery of a unit of study  |
| <b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WebCT use is in widespread across the Faculty and increasing as staff skills improve.</li> <li>• Feedback via WebCT is being used more frequently by members of staff.</li> <li>• Development and trial in several schools of WebCT as a support to clinical education, especially during fieldwork when students are off campus.</li> <li>• WebCT training programs and development workshops have been held regularly on campus as coordinated by the Faculty Education Connections director, Dr Mary Jane Mahony.</li> <li>• Incorporated into the TIF Project 2003-2004 (Appendix C.3), is a focus on the use of computer-supported strategies ie WebCT as an on-line learning support in terms of providing feedback. This focus will include both implementation in teaching programs and a grade descriptors development feedback loop.</li> </ul> <p>The following selected comments are indicative of those received from schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSD has proposed 2 new PG coursework programs which will be WebCT based</li> <li>• Most BIOS units use WebCT</li> <li>• OLS runs several graduate and undergraduate units of study via WebCT eg. <i>Politics and power in the workplace</i>.</li> <li>• OLS is trialing the use of WebCT within the Master of Occupational Therapy (MOT) problem based cases this semester. This will be evaluated. It is also being used in the undergraduate subject, Professional Practice 2.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most schools have staged plans to convert existing UOS to utilise WebCT as staff time and resources permit.</li> <li>• CSD reported that Scholarship Index money would be used to support lecturers to move their UOS on-line.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The progressive implementation of WebCT is occurring across the Faculty with academic units such as BIOS in the lead.</li> <li>• USE data will be monitored for student comment concerning WebCT</li> <li>• Presentations to teaching seminars and discussion within Clinical Education Committee.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, positive response to use of WebCT for clinical education, evaluation ongoing.</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Recommendation 6</b>  | The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider ways in which student nominations for excellence in teaching awards can be introduced   |
| <b>Action taken by the Faculty</b>                                     | <p><b>A/Dean T&amp;L:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty TLC fully supports this recommendation, but was concerned to establish a nomination process that would be simple and easy, thus encouraging students to participate. It was felt for instance that requiring any extensive written submission would get little response. The TLC decided to consult across the University to see what is being done elsewhere.</li> <li>• Consultation with Professor Michael Jackson and Dr Michael Paton from the Faculty of Economics and Business identified what they had found to be a successful process for a Student nominated Excellence in Teaching Award.</li> <li>• A proposal was put before the August 2003 Meeting of the FHS TLC.</li> <li>• Dean approved funding for a student nominated prize – August 2003.</li> <li>• Following further discussion by TLC, the proposal was referred to the Excellence in Teaching sub-committee. A subsequent report back has suggested that the process of student nominations needed careful planning and effective promotion to the student body, so the first award will occur in 2004.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation to be further discussed by the Excellence in Teaching Sub-Committee and a report tabled at the September TLC Meeting.</li> <li>• Expect to make the first award in 2004.</li> <li>• Publicity of this award mechanism will be given in 2004 with the view to get widespread participation.</li> <li>• Comments from HOSs indicate some schools are considering internal awards</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b>             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools are supportive of the idea.</li> <li>• Student Guild are supportive and we can use the student newspaper for publicity.</li> <li>• Evaluation will be made in 2004 of the response gained.</li> </ul>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Recommendation 7</b></p>            | <p>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider ways of improving the postgraduate research student experience, particularly in relation to developing a Faculty wide induction program, cross school connections, research seminars, and involvement in the business of the Faculty</p>   |
| <p><b>Action taken by the Faculty</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Faculty now has an ‘all postgraduate student email list’ operating. This provides an efficient method to alert students to relevant information (e.g. scholarships, lectures by Visiting Professors etc.). This email list will help FHS address one of the problems identified in the 2002 SREQ data (Appendix A.5), by providing a mechanism to invite students to be part of the normal scholarly activities of the campus.</li> <li>• The Faculty has been running an Induction Evening for PG students for several years and a high proportion of commencing HDR and coursework students attend. The 2003 program included a welcome from the Dean and presentations from the University DoGS, SUPRA, FHS library and FHS staff PG students with advice and experiences.</li> <li>• Small schools have identified HDR critical mass as an issue and there are now good initiatives being taken to group together and share events with larger units. Students do tend, however, to want to identify with their discipline group.</li> <li>• CSD is being most proactive in this area and is working with AVS, who have small numbers of PG students, to share resources</li> <li>• Most Schools now run mid-year mini conferences or presentation sessions for their HDR students and invite staff and students from other disciplines to attend. The attendance in 2003 has been good.</li> <li>• HScD students have a mandatory progress presentation seminar.</li> <li>• CSD PG students obtained Supra support to run a ‘get-together’ session prior to one of the School’s Twilight Seminars. Students met with HOS and PG coordinator to raise issues and concerns:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities included more student contact across the Faculty and research space on campus.</li> <li>• organise regular student study days on-campus and invited all research students.</li> <li>• organised Hypotheticals as a cross-Faculty seminar to encourage interaction between students from all Schools.</li> <li>• Moved research seminars to the evenings to encourage students to attend more regularly.</li> <li>• Encourage staff to do group supervision meetings so students can interact with each other as well as the supervisor.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Comments of the A/Dean Grad. Research:</b></p> <p><i>Improving experience:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have commenced working with Ms Tai Paseta of the ITL on strategies to improve student experience. This will be driven by information from the original Academic Board Review, 2002 SREQ data and two focus groups with FHS HDR students. We have completed the first focus group and produced a report and are in the middle of data collection for the final focus group. The plan is that the ITL will then produce a series of recommendations for the Faculty, based upon all this information. We expect that this will occur within the next month or so.</li> <li>• I have contacted Paul Binns from the ITL to obtain SREQ data for each School. This arrived last month and at the last GSC meeting we agreed that each School would inspect their SREQ data and prepare a list of areas that are clearly different to the University result. Schools would then need to develop a plan for how they would investigate/address the issues and this plan would be submitted to the September GSC meeting. A report of the actions taken and outcomes needs to be submitted to the GSC at the March 2004 GSC meeting.</li> <li>• We have formed policy to assist to improve student experience.</li> </ul> <p><i>FHS award for excellence in HDR supervision</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First award this year to A/Prof Kenny</li> </ul> <p><i>FHS guidelines for off-campus students</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires schools to provide evidence that appropriate arrangements have been made for</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>supervision, infrastructure, skill development and intellectual climate prior to enrolment.</p> <p><i>FHS guidelines on supervisor qualifications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides minimum academic qualifications for supervisors.</li> </ul> <p><i>FHS resource statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a mechanism for schools to fully inform students of the facilities that will be provided to them prior to commencing candidature.</li> </ul> <p><i>FHS 500 word report</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the proposal is to encourage pre-enrolment planning/preparation by the student, supervisor and school that will assist prompt commencement of research work and timely completion of the candidature.</li> </ul> <p><i>Induction programs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DOGS has developed a University-based induction program, this is supplemented by the induction day run by the Faculty and those run by Schools and HScD. The induction programs run by Schools and HScD run over the semester and are more akin to coursework. As well the FHS library runs workshops in both semesters on topics such as general database searching, use of Endnote, use of specialist databases.</li> </ul> <p><i>Research seminars:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These are now timetabled regularly by Schools. The most recent two were the HScD colloquium 8/08/03 and the BACHS PG research symposium (20/06/03), ESS and PT will hold days later this semester. These are open to all FHS staff and students.</li> </ul> <p><i>Cross-school connections:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In June Natalie Munro, a CSD HDR student, organised an FHS HDR student social, which will be repeated in November. The Faculty is supporting this initiative by providing a room free of charge whereas the Student Guild wanted to charge the students \$400.</li> </ul> <p><i>Involvement in the business of the FHS:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We now have an HDR student rep on GSC and FRC.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b></p> | <p><b>A/Dean Graduate Research:</b></p> <p><i>College level:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Faculty is part of College efforts to improve research supervision. The Associate Dean (GR) chairs the College Planning Committee for research students, participates in the Board of Post graduate Studies in Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmacy, and aims to migrate ‘best practice’ from the Board to the Faculty. We are supporting College-led policies, procedures and oversight of postgraduate research students and supervisors, with the operational management devolved to faculties and school. We are keen for all faculties in the College to have appropriate information technologies to support research training, eg, easy access to accurate postgraduate research student data, high-quality web site for prospective students.</li> </ul> <p><i>Induction programs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collating a list of formal and non-formal units offered in FHS for dissemination to HDR students. The plan is to allow the students flexibility to select units that suit their needs. Again this is more like coursework than an induction program.</li> </ul> <p><b>Schools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Feedback after the first BIOS conference from students and staff was very positive.</li> <li>• The idea of introducing a Faculty-wide seminar/workshop series has been taken by BIOS to the FRC.</li> <li>• CSD are currently developing a School PG student manual.</li> <li>• Most schools plan to ask more specific questions about these issues in their HDR progress interviews.</li> <li>• OLS will be implementing compulsory student presentations of their research from</li> </ul>  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>semester 1, 2004. This will involve students, clinicians and research supervisors. Students will be required to present at the beginning and then towards the end of their candidature (as a minimum).</p>   |
| <p><b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b></p> | <p><b>A/Dean Grad. Research:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Faculty Induction evening was highly praised by students, DOGS and the SUPRA president.</li> <li>• The HDR research seminars that have been run this year have been well attended and received by students and staff.</li> <li>• The feedback we have received from the HDR student representative is that the first FHS student social was an enormous success.</li> <li>• It is too early to establish if things have improved in students perceptions of the research experience because there is a long lag time on these sorts of things. If things moved quickly it would just be noise. You change policy, then hopefully attitudes and then practices of HOD, PG coordinators and supervisors and then things should improve for the students. We hopefully will see this reflected in the students' perceptions in the SREQ. I think that if these initiatives are to have an effect it will be first seen in the 2003 SREQ data, but more likely the 2004 data.</li> <li>• Staff have informally stated that they have found some of the policy initiatives helpful with their students. Eg one staff member stated that she found the resource statement helpful with a new applicant because they could see all the facilities the School provides and was appreciative of this. Both parties also valued the opportunity to clarify what resources the student was expected to supply and what resources the School would supply.</li> </ul> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Recommendation 8</b></p>  | <p>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider ways in which the physical and resource support for PhD students could be improved, particularly in relation to access to and sharing of computers. The Faculty should also consider ways in which to ensure that the increasing number of full-time PhD students have more privacy</p>  |
| <p><b>Action taken by the Faculty</b></p>                                     | <p>Some years ago the Faculty erected a purpose designed research building for cross faculty use. This was not well utilized as staff and students expressed a preference to work in the same general location as their peers and supervisor(s). The Faculty established a space review with the primary aim of co-locating teachers, researchers, students and research facilities.</p> <p>As a result, ESS who had major research infrastructure in the research building, moved in as a whole. CSD was relocated to better relate to their clinic and HIM and the National Centre for Classification in Health (NCCH) also moved to new areas. Residual free space was allocated to best meet the needs of on campus HDR students. It should be noted that many FHS HDR students are part time, working and by preference use infrastructure in their workplace.</p> <p><b>Schools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BACHS has acquired office space for PG students and now have two major spaces available. All research students now have access to a computer and a place to sit. Full-time students have a desk and their own allocated computer.</li> <li>• Most BIOS research students have been relocated to a new room with better privacy and facilities. This area accommodates 15 students, each student has a computer, some are in private cubicles, others share rooms with 2-3 other students.</li> <li>• CSD has purchased filing cabinets and lockers for PG students.</li> <li>• CSD gives priority to employment of PG students as CEs- this gives them an office and computer.</li> <li>• Most schools are moving to the use of a resource statement as described in the previous recommendation discussion.</li> </ul> <p><b>A/Dean Graduate Research.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GSC has no budget with which to dispense funds and has no control over Faculty or School infrastructure. Nevertheless the GSC has raised this issue with the Dean and Heads of School at a DMAC forum. As well the GSC has developed policy to require Schools to explicitly describe the facilities that will be provided to a HDR student:</li> </ul> <p><i>FHS guidelines for off-campus students</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires schools to provide evidence that appropriate arrangements have been made for supervision, infrastructure, skill development and intellectual climate prior to enrolment</li> </ul> <p><i>FHS resource statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a mechanism for schools to fully inform students of the facilities that will be provided to them prior to commencing candidature.</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</b></p> | <p><b>A/Dean Grad. Research.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DOGS has signaled that he has obtained funding from the VC for HDR student infrastructure. Faculties will be expected to match central funds. When this scheme is announced we will work closely with Schools to ensure that maximum benefits accrue to the Faculty.</li> <li>• Schools have identified their limited ability to fund the required the infrastructure needs of their HDR students. Proposals have been put to Faculty for consideration of a shared approach.</li> </ul>   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p><b>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Schools that have relocated students cite very positive feedback.</li><li>• More results will be available after the next round of student progress interviews and the next SREQ.</li></ul> <p><b>A/Dean Grad. Research.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• One staff member stated that she found the resource statement helpful with a new applicant because they could see all the facilities the School provides and was appreciative of this. Both parties also valued the opportunity to clarify what resources the student was expected to supply and what resources the School would supply.</li></ul> |
|---|---|